



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,583	03/23/2004	Jennifer L. Thompson	CN0201USNA	2249
23906	7590	03/22/2006	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY			LEE, RIP A	
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER			ART UNIT	
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128			PAPER NUMBER	
4417 LANCASTER PIKE			1713	
WILMINGTON, DE 19805			DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/806,583	Applicant(s) THOMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Rip A. Lee	Art Unit 1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09-07-04; 09-13-05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: Please insert the word "polycarboxylic" prior to the word "acid" so that the terminology is consistent with that of the parent claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1713

4. Claims 1-3 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Osborn *et al.* (U.S. 4,221,697).

Osborn *et al.* teaches a casting composition comprising a polymerizable organic liquid, inorganic filler particles, and polymeric dispersant. The first component is a methacrylate ester liquid monomer and/or preformed polymer (claims 1-5). The inorganic filler has a maximum particle size of 100 μ , and 95 % of the particles are of size 10 μ or less (col. 5, lines 10-15). There may also be incorporated coarse, granular filler particles having an average diameter of at least ten times greater than the average diameter of the inorganic filler. In this case, the average diameter of the granular filler is at least 100 μ . The polymeric dispersant contains a plurality of anchoring groups Y, wherein Y is a carboxyl/carboxylate group, and it has a molecular weight of at least 3000 (col. 6, lines 59-65). The reference does not show a working example wherein the distribution of the granular filler is at least 100 μ , however, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to make such a composition because Osborn *et al.* clearly establishes these guidelines in the text. And since the prior art indicates that this is a useful particle size, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected such an embodiment to produce a successful casting composition. It is also noted here that one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to arrive at the subject matter of the instant claims by use of inorganic filler with a maximum particle size of 100 μ and having 95 % of the particles are of size 10 μ or less (*i.e.*, 5 % may have a maximum size of 100 μ), because this limitation is taught specifically in the reference. By doing so, one of ordinary skill in the art would arrived at the subject matter of the instant claims because there is no indication that the first and second particles have necessarily different identity and because there is no indication of the magnitude of the claimed distribution. One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to use 1 wt % of the polymeric dispersant since the patent indicates that a handleable syrup contains at least 1 wt % of polymeric dispersant (col. 26, line 10).

Art Unit: 1713

5. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The particle distribution of the claim is not taught or made obvious in the cited prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rip A. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-1104. The examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached at (571)272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

ral

March 20, 2006



DAVID W. WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700